

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-16, 41 and 42 are in the application. Claims 1, 4-8, 14 and 41 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found at paragraph [0065] in the published version of the application, US 2004/0082385 A1. No claim is allowed.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. The following language appears in paragraph [0065] of the specification:

As described above with regard to **FIG. 1**, the peripheral *controller* can be assigned any of the various types of communication identification keys, depending on the application. (*Italics added*)

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the peripheral device.” Appropriate corrections of these claims have been made. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as directed to trademark names that are alleged indefinite and arbitrary definitions. The registered mark Bluetooth® has been deleted from the claim. The other terms objected to are standards and cannot be arbitrarily changed. The designated IEEE standards are immutable. If a feature is changed, the standard is assigned a new number. Regarding Home RF, that is a communication protocol that was controlled by a group that was disbanded in 2003. Hence, the protocol as it exists in devices in use is known and cannot change. The protocol, as defined by the group that created it, it cannot change since the group ceased to exist in 2003. The best information available indicates that this protocol is obsolete. It is thus no longer in use except in devices that were made when the protocol was in use. Moreover, although the term “IEEE” alone is a registered trademark, the terms used with the designated standard number are not known to be registered trademarks. It is

therefore submitted that the terms in the amended claims are communication standards that are known and cannot be arbitrarily changed. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-16 and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cole et al. (“Cole,” US 2004/0137978) in view of Lazzarotto et al (“Lazzarotto,” US 6,782,245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The examiner cites Par. [0119] and [0120] in Cole. In Par. [0119], it is disclosed that game station **20** may comprise two separate units and that the second unit may be linked to the first with a wireless connection permitting transfer of credit information. But it is not shown that the gaming units have a communications manager that can configure a peripheral controller to communicate wirelessly with both the master gaming controller and another peripheral device. Par. [0119] discloses the transmittal of only credit information between machines. That is not the same as managing and configuring peripheral controllers. Par. [0120] discloses that two games (not the gaming machines *per se*) may be linked to a single coupon reader, either through a single master controller, or through separate gaming controllers. This does not show that a gaming controller in a gaming machine wirelessly manages and configures the coupon reader. In view of the teachings of Par. [0119], if there is any wireless communication, it is only to transmit credit information between gaming machines. Accordingly, Cole is at least defective in showing

a wireless communication manager executed by the master gaming controller adapted for managing wireless communications between (i) the master gaming controller and the peripheral devices, (ii) the peripheral devices, or both (i) and (ii); and

the wireless communication manager further adapted to configure a peripheral controller associated with one of the one or more of the peripheral devices to be configured to communicate wirelessly with both the master gaming controller and another peripheral device;

the wireless communication manager adapted for managing wireless communications including being adapted to configure the peripheral controller by assigning a communication identification key to the peripheral controller.

Cole can only manage the peripherals using the master gaming controller 101 (FIG. 6) in the configuration for which the system is wired. Configuration or reconfiguration of the peripheral controller by a communication manager is not addressed in Cole.

The reliance on Lazzarotto does not remedy the deficiencies of Cole. Lazzarotto (3:17-31) does not disclose a wireless communication manager adapted to configure a peripheral controller by assigning a communication identification key to the peripheral controller. The cited passage relates to decoding an incoming data signal from a peripheral and to determine if it is valid (i.e. no errors; see 6:48-54) and if it is compatible with the USB format in use. The processor 106 (Fig. 1 in Lazzarotto) is not a peripheral controller. See the peripheral controllers 124 in Fig. 1 of the present application. The processor 106, as presumably applied by the examiner by reference to Lazzarotto 3:1-41, is a wireless communication manager. But is it not suggested or disclosed to have the capability of configuring each peripheral device through its controller to communicate wirelessly with both the master gaming controller and another peripheral device. Decoding an incoming data signal is not the capability of configuring the peripheral device. Thus, Lazzarotto fails to suggest a

wireless communication manager adapted to configure a peripheral controller associated with one of the one or more of the peripheral devices to be configured to communicate wirelessly with both the master gaming controller and another peripheral device;

the wireless communication manager adapted for managing wireless communications including being adapted to configure the peripheral controller by assigning a communication identification key to the peripheral controller.

It is submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made from the teaching of Cole in view of Lazzarotto to provide a gaming machine master gaming controller with a wireless communication manager, capable configuring peripheral controllers in a manner as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the independent claims and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over the combination of Cole and Lazzarotto. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that entry of this amendment places the above-identified patent application in condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any further extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P060X2).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/Reginald J. Suyat/
Reginald J. Suyat
Reg. No. 28,172

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100